IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Cowan Lamar Brown,

Petitioner,

v.

Attorney General of the State of Arizona, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV-23-00026-PHX-DWL

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Petitioner's amended petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 5) and the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. 13). The R&R, which was issued on August 28, 2023, recommended that the petition be denied and further provided that "the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the Court." (Doc. 13 at 23.)

Here, no such objections have been filed. Thus, the Court accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See, e.g., Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985) ("It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) ("[N]o review is required of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation unless objections are filed."). *See also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) ("[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations

de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise."). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the R&R's recommended disposition (Doc. 13) is accepted, that the amended petition (Doc. 5) is denied, and that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal be **DENIED** because petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. Dated this 27th day of September, 2023. Dominic W. Lanza United States District Judge